

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

(The remarks of Mr. HOLLINGS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1821 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer a few remarks on behalf of myself and also the distinguished Senator from Oregon with regard to the brouhaha that has broken out over the Intelligence Committee and our inquiry into the possible existence of weapons of mass destruction and the use of intelligence information by this administration.

In many ways, it is an unfortunate debate because if there is one thing that should absolutely be above and beyond partisanship, it is the Intelligence Committee, our intelligence services, and the use to which that information is put. We need to dedicate ourselves not to scoring political points but, instead, to protecting the national interest. When we have Members' motives cast in a bad light and heated rhetoric used, it does not serve that purpose in any way whatsoever.

Senator ROCKEFELLER, the ranking member on the Intelligence Committee, has been doing a very admirable job. It is my strong impression that he has been pursuing his responsibilities in a bipartisan way, trying to get at the truth in a way that is consistent with the finest traditions of the Intelligence Committee.

I have never seen the report that has been alluded to. I understand it was simply a listing of possible options. And I can guarantee you that Senator ROCKEFELLER has been under intense pressure by some others to pursue a much more partisan line of inquiry and to be much more confrontational. Instead, he has chosen to try to pursue the cooperative path first. I compliment him for that because it is exactly the course that needs to be pursued on the Intelligence Committee and in this body. Most importantly, we need to get beyond this current controversy.

I happen to think those who are watching this debate out beyond the beltway are scratching their heads and saying: There they go again. What on Earth are they doing?

We have gone to war at least in part because of the possible existence of weapons of mass destruction in the nation of Iraq. Our credibility is at stake. We need to get to the bottom of this and understand, if they do exist, what we can do to root them out and, if they do not exist, why we were led to believe they do exist. This is important to ensuring the national security interests of our country.

We also need to get to the bottom of allegations about the possible manipu-

lation or misuse of intelligence in the runup to the war—not for the purpose of scapegoating or witch hunting but for the purposes of ensuring that in fact it never takes place.

Those in the majority shouldn't stonewall or circle the wagons, and those on our side of the aisle shouldn't engage in finger pointing and trying to score political points in a runup to a Presidential election next year. We need an objective, dispassionate search for the truth. That is what the American people deserve. It is my understanding that is what Senator ROCKEFELLER is pursuing.

Finally, the British have some experience in this area. They have just recently gone through an inquiry of their own over what was allegedly the "dodgy dossier." I think that is how it is referred to in British circles. The Prime Minister even had to offer evidence under oath as part of that inquiry.

No one is suggesting anything so intrusive on our side of the aisle. On the contrary, we would like to pursue this in a cooperative, nonpartisan manner to get at the truth, to determine whether weapons of mass destruction existed and, if not, why we were led to believe they did, and always to fairly and dispassionately analyze how information from the intelligence world was used in making the case to pursue the ouster of Saddam Hussein. That is in the national security interests of our country.

I salute Senator ROCKEFELLER for taking the appropriate course. I hope this debate will calm down and refocus on the business at hand, which is protecting the national security of our country, rather than engaging in heated, partisan rhetoric which we have way too much of around this town and in this Chamber.

Those are my thoughts.

I again compliment Senator ROCKEFELLER, and I look forward to working with Members on both sides of the aisle to bring about that kind of inquiry.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I very much share the view of the Senator from Indiana. I simply say that a lot of paper floats around Capitol Hill that never sees the light of day. The document that has to guide the members of the Intelligence Committee—both Democrats and Republicans—is the Constitution of the United States. That is the tone that our vice chairman, Senator ROCKEFELLER, has consistently set throughout this effort to get at the facts with respect to Iraq. That is the path I think every Member of the Senate ought to continue to follow. It ought to be a bipartisan goal. The American people deserve no less.

There are legitimate and very troubling questions that need to be answered about the intelligence used to bring this Nation to war in Iraq. In fact, serious issues have come up just in the last week.

I will say that I found it exceptionally troubling—really chilling—that just last week, Paul Bremer, who is the point man with respect to the efforts on the ground in Iraq, was asked about the nature of the Iraqi resistance and in fact was told there really wasn't a capability in the intelligence community to give our country the information that is so necessary to protect our courageous men and women who are in harm's way.

That is the kind of issue about which I think every Member of the Senate ought to be concerned. That is what the Intelligence Committee ought to be tackling in a bipartisan way. That is what Senator ROCKEFELLER has consistently been trying to do.

We can go through a lot of the past history. Certainly, in discussions about weapons of mass destruction, we were told right here in the U.S. Capitol on a number of occasions that those weapons have not materialized. There are issues with respect to the past that need to be examined. There are issues such as the point Mr. Bremer made just in the last week that I think are very troubling.

I just urge that every Member of the Senate—and certainly those on the Intelligence Committee—recognize it is not the paper that floats around here that may or may not see the light of day and various kinds of draft documents that are important; what is important is that we do the work of oversight. That is what is in line with the document that ought to guide us—the Constitution of the United States. And that is what Senator ROCKEFELLER has set out for us in his work. I commend him for it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

(The remarks of Mr. AKAKA pertaining to the introduction of S. 1822 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended for 20 minutes, equally divided between this side and the Republican side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair inform me when 5 minutes have been utilized so I can share the remainder of our time with the Senator from New Jersey. I think the Senator from Indiana may be on his way over as well.

CREATION AND USE OF INTELLIGENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, early this morning there was a discussion on the

floor of a staff memo from some Intelligence Committee staffers which had not either been authorized or indeed shared by members of the Intelligence Committee. But it was characterized—and I think mischaracterized, quite clearly—as a Democratic plan relative to the review of the intelligence that was created and used prior to the Iraqi war.

The only thing that Democratic members of the Intelligence Committee have pressed is for a full investigation, a full inquiry into not just the creation of the intelligence but the use of that intelligence.

Without looking at the use of intelligence that was created by the intelligence community, there would only be half a picture painted. Hopefully, that half of a picture will be fully explored on a bipartisan basis. I think the first half of the picture, indeed, is being fully explored on a bipartisan basis. That is the part of the picture that looks at the intelligence community's production of intelligence and as to whether or not that intelligence community in some way either shaped or exaggerated that intelligence for whatever purpose. It has also been now added that if any of the administration put pressure on the intelligence community that would also be included in the review.

But what is left out is the critical half of the picture which the American public hears, which is the use of the intelligence given to the policymakers by those policymakers. Now, the word "use" of intelligence, that word "use" actually appears in the resolution creating the Intelligence Committee and identifying the oversight role of the Intelligence Committee. So the word "use" is actually embedded in the very document creating the Intelligence Committee that sets forth what its role will be and what its oversight responsibilities are. Yet so far the majority of the Intelligence Committee has said: We will not look at the use of the intelligence which was given to the policymakers.

Now, that is a huge gap. That means we will be walking up to the water's edge and stopping there. That means instead of letting the chips fall where they may, the chips will only be allowed to fall on the intelligence community's side of the fence. They will not be allowed to fall on the policymakers' role and responsibility.

We were told by the policymakers, prior to the war, that—this is Secretary Rumsfeld—

We know where the weapons of mass destruction are.

We were told, before the war, by the Vice President:

Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction.

We were told, before the war, by the President, himself, that:

Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraqi regime continues to possess and conceal

some of the most lethal weapons ever devised.

So the heart of the problem that we have at the Intelligence Committee is whether or not we are going to stop at that water's edge or look at the use of the intelligence, whether a critique will be made of the intelligence community's shaping or exaggeration, to the extent that existed, or whether or not the same searchlight will be placed upon the policymakers as to whether they exaggerated or shaped or misstated what was given to them by the intelligence community.

The Department of State had a Web site. On December 19 of last year, that Web site said:

Why is the Iraqi regime hiding their uranium procurement?

This is months after the CIA apparently told the State Department that there was no such effort on the part of Iraq to obtain uranium, or at least that they had not reached that conclusion. Yet in December—and by the way, much later—the State Department's Web site still is representing to the public that the Iraqi regime is hiding uranium procurement.

Why should we not look into that Web site? How does that Web site get created, despite what we now believe was the intelligence community's conclusion or lack of conclusion relative to uranium acquisition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CORZINE. I thank the Chair. I appreciate very much the comments of the Senator from Michigan, particularly in informing the Senate that the charge of the Intelligence Committee includes the use of intelligence as part of its mission.

Frankly, this whole discussion of this leaked memo today only reinforces my own view that we need an independent, bipartisan commission because it is now becoming a political debate about whether there is politics inside the Intelligence Committee.

I listened to the earlier discussion on the floor. People are talking about Presidential politics and talking about how inappropriate it is for people to talk in a thoughtful manner about how processes may occur over a period of time. We are missing the point.

There are men and women who are dying in Iraq because either the development or the use of our intelligence is not at a level where we are protecting the people of America and the men and women in uniform.

The issue is not whether this is a political debate. The issue is whether Iraq possessed chemical or biological weapons.

It is whether Iraq had links to al-Qaida or whether Iraq attempted to acquire uranium. It is an issue of whether we are going to turn loose the names of our intelligence operatives because there is political use of the need or

want to discredit someone who might challenge some of the answers to the questions I just raised.

We have a fundamental question right here and now of whether we are going to have an intelligence operation that informs policymakers so they can make good decisions or whether we are going to have an intelligence operation that is used to justify policy decisions already taken.

The idea that we are going to debate whether this is a political issue or not really does argue in the strongest terms that we need to have an independent, bipartisan approach to understanding whether the development of our intelligence was appropriate and whether the use of that was even consistent or whether it was designed to justify as opposed to inform.

When men and women are dying, I don't understand why we are even thinking about this in the context of politics on either side of the aisle. The real issue is, we ought to get to the bottom of it. What led to decisions that don't match the reality we have come to find on the ground in Iraq?

I have over and over again—and will again—asked for an independent investigation, a bipartisan investigation, a commission to understand why we don't know what we should have known when we entered into this. It seems to me that is the essence and the most important issue we ought to be discussing, not some memo that wasn't seen by anybody else in the committee, developed by a staffer as a concept memo. That really diverts from the fundamental issue of protecting our men and women, protecting the people of the United States.

By the way, there is some reason to believe we are not getting all the information, whether it is in the Intelligence Committee. We know the independent commission studying 9/11 has said they have been stonewalled. People from both sides of the commission, as far as political background, have said that. They had to subpoena information from the FAA to be able to get information to move forward to investigate.

We are missing the point. One of the reasons I do believe we need an independent, bipartisan commission is so we don't have the kind of discussion we had on the floor today, so we can get to the facts that actually will protect the American men and women in uniform. It is high time we put our priorities right, which is understanding how our intelligence operations develop and how they are used, not whether we have a political issue that can be talked about on the talk shows at night.

I find it very hard when senior people in the State Department, who have worked there 25 or 30 years, say, speaking about folks, that we have a faith-based approach to intelligence, that we are developing intelligence to show what we want to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Parliamentary inquiry: What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 8 minutes remaining in morning business that the Senator may consume or yield back.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, given that opportunity, I will consume a few of those minutes to respond to the conversations about Iraq.

I was in this body when we went to S-407 and heard the intelligence community brief us on the manufacture of chemical weapons taking place at what appeared to be a pharmaceutical factory in the Sudan. We were told repeatedly by high officials of the administration this was a plant producing weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons; it had to be taken out by a cruise missile. Some of us asked to see the intelligence. We asked to know exactly what it was that led the administration to believe this was in fact a chemical plant.

As we were given that intelligence, I found myself questioning it. I walked away from that meeting saying to myself: This is a little bit thin. There is not a lot of substance here. But administration officials were very emphatic in saying, no, we have gone through the intelligence. It is very firm. We have to take this out.

The administration in this instance, of course, was the Clinton administration. The intelligence being presented to us was being presented by Secretary Cohen, the Secretary of Defense. We now know the intelligence was wrong. This was not, in fact, a factory for weapons of mass destruction. It was, rather, a pharmaceutical plant, just as the people said it was.

We blew it up nonetheless. We killed some people with the cruise missiles we threw in there. After recognizing the intelligence was wrong, we apologized, as indeed we should.

The question I would ask those who are now raising the issue about intelligence in Iraq would be this: Would they suggest the result of our actions in Iraq called for an American apology? Are they suggesting we should apologize to the people of Iraq for having taken out Saddam Hussein and, when we find him, replace him in power?

This is a man who killed 300,000 of his own people. We have uncovered the mass graves. This is a man responsible for over 1 million additional deaths in the two wars he started with his neighbors.

This is a man who has destroyed his own country. This is a man who has raped and brutalized those of his citi-

zens whom he has not killed. This is a man who was willing to pay \$25,000 to anyone who would wrap himself in dynamite and blow himself up, as long as he took some others with him. This is a man who had weapons of mass destruction and has used them against his own people. This is a man whose actions are clearly in violation of the U.N. Resolution 1441.

Am I supposed to apologize for having supported an effort to remove him just because some people are challenging the details of the intelligence that led us to this action? I do not apologize for one moment for supporting the war or for supporting the supplemental to pay for the war, because the consequences of the action we have taken have liberated over 20 million people and made the neighborhood in which Saddam Hussein lived substantially safer for all of the neighbors around him.

This is not similar to the case of the blowing up of a pharmaceutical plant in Sudan because the intelligence was faulty, which took place in the Clinton administration. This is an action that history will look back upon and say we did the right thing.

With that, I yield back the remainder of morning business time.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

AGRICULTURAL, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to H.R. 2673, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2673) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause be stricken, that amendment No. 2072, which is the text of Calendar No. 216, S. 1427, the Senate committee-reported bill, be inserted in lieu thereof, that the bill, as amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendments, and that no points of order be waived by reason of this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am pleased to present the Agriculture appropriations subcommittee report to

the full Senate and to recommend passage of this bill. I am very grateful to the ranking member, Senator KOHL, and his professional staff.

It has been one of the most satisfying experiences of my service in the Senate to see how Senator KOHL's staff and our staff have been integrated and have performed as truly professional staffs, regardless of any partisan affiliation. I think one of the reasons the bill moved as smoothly as it did through subcommittee and full committee is that the staffs have worked together in such a professional way. I am grateful to Senator KOHL for his wisdom in the people he has chosen, and I am grateful to them for the professional way in which they have handled it.

The bill is at the 302(b) discretionary allocation level of \$17.005 billion. That is \$873 million less than the fiscal 2003 level, which was \$17.878 billion.

It is always difficult to bring an appropriations bill to the floor that has an allocation lower than the previous year and, in this case, it is almost \$1 billion lower. That has made the challenge of putting the bill together extremely difficult and, once again, underscores the accomplishments of the professional staff as they have dealt with this challenge.

To run through the various titles of the bill and help people understand what we are talking about, I will give you the following numbers.

On title I, dealing with agricultural programs, we have a total of \$26.776 billion, of which \$20.658 billion is mandatory. This is \$1.318 million more than fiscal year 2003.

On food safety, it is \$783.761 million, which is an increase of \$28.9 million over fiscal 2003. The Agricultural Research Service is at \$1.092 billion. The Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service is at \$1.118 billion. The Animal and Plant Inspection Service, APHIS, is at \$711 million. That takes care of title I.

Title II, conservation programs, come in at a total of \$973 million, which is \$48 million less than fiscal 2003. Conservation operations are at \$826.635 million.

Title III, rural economic and community development programs, the total appropriated funds will be \$2.588 billion, which will support a loan level of \$4.353 billion. Single-family housing is at the \$4.084 billion level. The Rural Community Advancement Program is at \$769.479 million. Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband is at \$685.963 million.

Title IV, domestic food programs, there is a total of \$44.088 billion, of which \$39.164 billion is mandatory. This is \$2.197 billion more than fiscal 2003. Food stamps will be funded at \$27.745 billion. WIC, Women, Infants, and Children, will be funded at \$4.639 billion.

Title V, foreign assistance and related programs, there is a total of \$1.486 billion, which is \$349 million less than fiscal year 2003, which included supplemental funding of \$369 million.